

the fingerprints 495
Memorandum of A. C. Studer, Jr.

Memorandum of conference on Saturday, October 23rd, with Mr. Kuhne and Mr. Taylor, in the presence of Mr. McCarter, Mr. Pfeiffer and myself.

Both Mr. Kuhne and Mr. Taylor said it is important to learn when the prints were developed. They also agreed that a better grade card will hold the finger print longer and permit a longer time in development.

Four years ago, Fitzpatrick came to Kuhne and showed him a right thumb print on a paper. Shortly after the 1922 Grand Jury did not indict, Fitzpatrick said that David had belittled the finger print on ^{the} paper, but that he, Fitzpatrick, thought the case was not over yet. Shortly after Simpson entered the case and about the time the picture appeared in the Mirror, Simpson telephoned to Kuhne and asked him about the paper, regarding which Fitzpatrick had spoken. About a week ago, that is, on October 16th, Fitzpatrick's brother was in Kuhne's office and said that Simpson had never sent for him to look for a photograph of the finger print in his brother's absence although Kuhne had told Simpson he thought a search would reveal it.

Both Kuhne and Taylor agreed that it cannot be determined just when finger prints were put on a card. They also agreed that finger prints can be forged. Kuhne said he could forge a finger print so well that he himself cannot tell the forgery from the original. Both agreed that a card in the grass for two or three days and nights or even two or three weeks will retain a print because the oily secretion repels the moisture. Kuhne said it is at best, questionable, that a card in the grass for three or four days and nights will not retain a print. Both agreed that if a finger print is properly developed and then fixed and is covered with a mixture

14